

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
2
3 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
4

5
6 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
7 AND INTERFERENCES
8

9
10 Ex parte PAUL P. LATTA
11

12
13 Appeal 2007-1152
14 Application 10/660,924
15 Technology Center 1600
16

17
18 Oral Hearing Held: Wednesday, September 12, 2007
19

20
21
22 Before ERIC GRIMES, LORA M. GREEN, and RICHARD M.
23 LEOVITZ, Administrative Patent Judges
24

25
26 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANTS:
27

28 DANIEL E. ALTMAN, ESQ.
29 Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP
30 2040 Main Street, 14th Floor
31 Irvine, CA 92614
32 (949) 760-0404
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

1 Appeal 2007-1152
2 Application 10/660,924

3
1 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Wednesday,
2 September 12, 2007, commencing at 2:12 p.m., at the U.S. Patent and
3 Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, 9th Floor, Hearing Room A,
4 Alexandria, Virginia, before Jan M. Jablonsky, Notary Public.

5 JUDGE GRIMES: Good afternoon, Mr. Altman.

6 MR. ALTMAN: Good afternoon.

7 JUDGE GRIMES: As you probably know, you'll have 20
8 minutes to address each of the separate applications that we're going to talk
9 about today.

10 I guess we'd like to start with Serial Number 10/660924. And
11 then once we're done talking about that one, we can move on to the other
12 one.

13 JUDGE LEBOVITZ: Mr. Altman, with respect to that one,
14 could you begin off with the new matter rejection? Because the enablement
15 was pretty well addressed. So can we just start off with the new matter
16 description rejection?

17 MR. ALTMAN: Okay. I just wanted to say a couple of
18 background information, a little bit of background information related to
19 both cases, if that's okay.

20 JUDGE LEBOVITZ: Sure, thanks.

21 MR. ALTMAN: Both of these cases relate from the same
22 discovery and my client wanted me to present to you that he is an
23 independent inventor, that he's worked in the laboratories of several different
24 prominent researchers both at universities and companies. And so he's been
25 working very diligently on this for quite some time as you can see from the

7 Appeal 2007-1152
8 Application 10/660,924

1 record. So that was just some background that my client specifically asked
2 me to provide to you.

3 And you asked me to address the new matter issue. It's fairly
4 clear what the support in the specification for this particular limitation that
5 the Examiner objected to.

6 JUDGE LEBOVITZ: Can, I? I'm sorry, just to rephrase it, the
7 Examiner at the very end, because there were a number of issues in there, at
8 the very end of his rejection he points out that no where do you teach the
9 one-step of administering a preventive dose.

10 MR. ALTMAN: I see. Okay. So, because the particular issue
11 is the issue of where do we get the one to two orders of magnitude less and
12 that's not the issue that you're interest in?

13 JUDGE LEBOVITZ: Well, I think that's coupled to that and I
14 think that if you look at the end of the answer, the Examiner clearly stated in
15 the spec, in particular, I think he alleged in the summary of the invention the
16 two-step where you administer a tolerizing dose followed by a curative dose.
17 So if you could just point out the support for the single dose?

18 MR. ALTMAN: I understand. Okay. Let me find this section
19 again. Okay. On page 19 of the specification is the section which is on
20 implants for prevention of diseases. And the section that is relevant has to
21 do with diabetes. And this section relates to the implants of islets which are
22 conducted for the prevention of diabetes. And the section relates to the
23 identification of patients for preventions of disease and it says that what
24 happens is that the individuals are determined to be at risk of developing
25 diabetes and then the amount of dose which is used for tolerizing is the same
26 for the tolerizing dose in the curative area.

10
11
12

13 Appeal 2007-1152
14 Application 10/660,924

15
1 And the whole point of this aspect of the invention is to prevent
2 diabetes from developing. If Diabetes is prevented from developing there
3 would be no point to introducing a curative dose. So the entire purpose of
4 this section of the invention is that there is no diabetes to treat. And the
5 second step has to do with the curative, has to do with the curative aspect of
6 this invention.

7 JUDGE LEBOVITZ: But if you read the whole specification,
8 the concept comes across that what we're going to do is to tolerize a patient
9 to an allograft and then we're going to introduce a curative dose of the
10 allograft so we can grow a pancreas. And in that sense, will prevent the
11 onset of diabetes by having the transplanted pancreas present as the old
12 pancreas, I guess, is dying or is being destroyed through whatever
13 mechanisms. But right here, since it does refer to a tolerizing implant, to me
14 that implies or says that you are tolerizing to the curative dose.

15 MR. ALTMAN: I see. The idea behind this aspect of the
16 invention is that it's well-known that diabetes is an autoimmune disease and
17 that the idea behind tolerizing in this aspect of the invention, which should
18 be clear to one having ordinary skill in the art who has read all of the
19 literature explaining that diabetes type 1 is an auto-immune disease, the idea
20 here is to prevent that autoimmune reaction from occurring in the first place.

21 And so, if that autoimmune reaction does not occur, it's clear
22 that there would be no reason to introduce the second curative dose.

23 JUDGE LEBOVITZ: Well, I see the prevention of the
24 auto-immune response to have been stated in Dr. Sharp's declaration. But is
25 that in the specification as well?

16
17
18

19 Appeal 2007-1152
20 Application 10/660,924

21
1 MR. ALTMAN: Well, what it says is that the physician
2 determines at what point in the course of the disease it would be most
3 advantageous to intervene. And it's that part of the specification that would
4 lead one having ordinary skill in the art to understand that the purpose of this
5 is to intervene in the autoimmune process. It certainly was the intent of the
6 inventor to intervene in the prevention of diabetes by preventing the
7 ideology of the disease from carrying out its full course.

8 JUDGE GRIMES: Is there any discussion in the specification
9 of this tolerizing implant having an effect in adducing tolerization of the
10 patient's own cells? My impression is you're tolerizing with respect to what
11 you want to implant later on.

12 MR. ALTMAN: That is the subject matter of the other case
13 that's at issue today.

14 JUDGE GRIMES: Right, but does the spec actually talk
15 somewhere about the tolerizing implant effecting the body's immune
16 reaction against its own cells?

17 MR. ALTMAN: Well, there is a connection with myasthenia
18 gravis. There is Example 5, and also Example 7, which are prevention of
19 hemophilia and prevention of myasthenia gravis. These are of course
20 extensions of the invention which are not claimed, but these relate to these
21 autoimmune disorders that can be prevented using the topic of the present
22 invention.

23 So Example 7 specifically identifies myasthenia gravis as an
24 autoimmune disorder. And in Example 7, what is happening is there's a
25 single administration of the encapsulated cells and that results in tolerization
26 to the autoimmune reaction, which would typically occur in myasthenia

22
23
24

25 Appeal 2007-1152

26 Application 10/660,924

27
1 gravis. Example 6 would be similar too. It's just relating to a transplant.

2 That's also somewhat, a little bit different, but somewhat of an autoimmune
3 reaction. So in combination with these examples--

4 JUDGE GRIMES: Could I? Oh, I see. Never mind. I was just
5 getting confused what were examples. Go on, sorry.

6 MR. ALTMAN: So, these examples show that a one-step
7 process was intended for an autoimmune disorder, such as diabetes melitis.

8 JUDGE LEOVITZ: Well, it looks like Example 7 seems to
9 be the closest. Right, where there's just one tolerizing dose given that
10 prevents a disorder. I think in the others to me, at least in Example 6, they're
11 tolerizing and then giving a complete organ again.

12 MR. ALTMAN: Example 6, you're right about that.

13 JUDGE LEOVITZ: Yeah.

14 MR. ALTMAN: Yeah, Example 7 is clearly only one dose of
15 the myasthenia gravis and it's the same principle that would be used in
16 treatment of diabetes.

17 JUDGE LEOVITZ: Was that addressed? I don't think that
18 was addressed in the Declaration. I'm just asking the question.

19 MR. ALTMAN: I'm not sure I understand what.

20 JUDGE LEOVITZ: I was just asking if you remembered
21 whether Dr. Sharp had brought that Example up in his deck?

22 MR. ALTMAN: No. I don't believe he did discuss it
23 specifically.

24 So the entire idea behind this aspect of the invention was
25 always to give a single step, and that's what's disclosed in Example 7. And

28
29
30

31 Appeal 2007-1152
32 Application 10/660,924

33
1 diabetes, although there's not an example of it, is specifically exemplified in
2 the paragraph on page 19, line 9.

3 Shall I address briefly the other issue? You said it's fairly well
4 addressed in writing.

5 JUDGE LEBOVITZ: I don't really think you need to, but of
6 course if you want to or if you want to summarize it, feel free to do that.

7 MR. ALTMAN: Okay. I'll just do it very briefly then.

8 The issue here that the Examiner raised is whether it was
9 predictable that the invention could be used in mammals other than mice.
10 And we seem to have gotten into a match of dueling papers with the
11 Examiner. And I wanted to point out that the MPEP sets forth a standard for
12 what type of data can be used in connection with whether the invention can
13 be viewed as predictable.

14 And the standard that the MPEP sets forth is it's much more in
15 line with the standard that we have been proposing then, what the Examiner
16 has been proposing. And the data that was presented in Dr. Sharp's initial
17 Declaration, it was really, truly outstanding. It was incredible that these
18 mice that ordinarily develop diabetes as an autoimmune response, without
19 any treatment dose were able to remain diabetes free for as long as nine
20 months, which was the term of that study. So it was somewhat surprising to
21 the inventor of course that the Examiner found it unpersuasive.

22 And I wanted to point out also that at least one of the groups,
23 100% of the mice remained diabetic free between the course of the
24 experiment.

25 So, if there are any other questions I can answer about that
26 aspect, I'd be happy to. Or about the Declaration, you asked earlier.

34
35
36

37 Appeal 2007-1152
38 Application 10/660,924

³⁹
1 JUDGE LEBOVITZ: No. That was fine.

2 MR. ALTMAN: Okay.

3 JUDGE GRIMES: Any other questions?

4 JUDGE LEBOVITZ: No.

5 JUDGE GRIMES: That's all we need to discuss about this
6 particular case. Thank you, very much.

7 [Whereupon, at 2:26 p.m., the hearing was concluded.]

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

⁴⁰
41

42